



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Hecker really wants his Freshmen to know is not Latin literature so much as the civilization of the later Roman Empire, a laudable desire. But the way to accomplish this is not to make room for selections from later authors covering this subject, but to assign in connection with the work of the class, such reading from books like Dill's or Friedländer's as may convey the information that Mr. Hecker has in mind. In fact it would be a very valuable addition to the work of any Freshman class, if the students were expected to read around the actual authors studied. Our results are pitifully narrow, but after all we still are trying to teach Latin literature, and to bring our students into more or less intimate relation with some great minds. And this is really the best education.

G. L.

THE ENCOMIUM ON HELEN, BY GORGIAS¹

In the centuries succeeding Homer we find in Greek literature numerous disparaging animadversions on Helen of Sparta and Troy. Celebrated and familiar is the recantation of Stesichorus, who was compelled to retract, in the famous palinode, his abuse of the lady. It will be recalled that Aeschylus (Agam. 689), punning on her name, calls her, as Browning translates, "Ship's-hell, Man's-hell, City's-hell".

The praise of Helen, however, became a favorite theme with the rhetoricians. The difficulty of a vindication was a constant invitation and challenge to their rhetorical skill and ingenuity. We find the Dean of the Professors of Rhetoric, Isocrates, devoting himself warmly to this subject in Oration 10. At the beginning of this discourse (Sec. 14) he praises the writer of an extant Encomium on Helen for choice of subject, but finds fault with him for writing not an encomium, but a defence and apology, and proceeds further to say, in his usual self-satisfied way, that he will show this writer, unfortunately not named, how the subject should have been treated.

Does Isocrates allude to the Encomium by his teacher, Gorgias? Most probably. Certainly the criticism applies to Gorgias. Is the so-called Encomium on Helen which is extant under the name of Gorgias authentic? Spengel and Jebb (see *The Attic Orators*), think not; the latter declares that the composition does not bear any of the distinctive marks of the style of Gorgias! This seems an amazing statement, inasmuch as the Encomium fairly bristles with all the characteristic Gorgian figures and frigidities. Blass (in *Attische Beredsamkeit* 1.66 and in the Teubner text of Antiphon, page xxviii) and Norden (*Die antike Kunstprosa*) believe that it is genuine. In this view I concur.

What are the figures and the rhetorical devices

which produce the Gorgian *ὀγκος*, magnificent and monotonous, and that style which is characterised by a plethora of words and a paucity of ideas? They are antithesis, paronomasia, alliteration, repetition of words, likeness of sound in final syllables of successive words and clauses, and arrangement of words in nearly equal periods. Add to these, alternating amplification and brevity, a rhythm making prose akin to poetry, bold metaphors and poetic or unusual epithets. The Encomium on Helen abounds in all these.

Is it surprising that the Athenians in the assembly were carried away by the novelty of this brilliant oratory, when, in 427 B.C. they were addressed by the rhetor Gorgias, the head of the Sicilian envoys? For, as Diodorus (12.53) says, the Athenians, by nature, were clever and lovers of eloquence. Especially were the young men captivated and Gorgias's services as a teacher were in great demand.

These characteristics of Gorgias's style, which impress us as inartistic in the extreme, met with high praise or strong censure in his own and subsequent generations. But the potent influence of the Sicilian rhetor is easily seen alike on the style of Antiphon, of Thucydides and of Isocrates. With Gorgias begins epideictic literature, that display rhetoric, which was destined ever afterwards to color and to influence profoundly Greek oratory and prose style.

It is my aim to give an English version of the most interesting portions of the Helen, a short but astounding composition in which the innovator and master of *ἡ ποιητικὴ καὶ τροπικὴ φράσις* fairly out-did himself. Yet in justice to Gorgias it must be remembered that the author, at the conclusion of his effort, characterizes it as a *παλῖνον*. Lack of space forbids the occasional quotation of the Greek which would show, I hope, that the translation is faithful to the florid and frigid original. References by section, however, are made to the text of the Helen, which is to be found in the Teubner edition of Antiphon (ed. by Blass).

1. Embellishment to a city is the valor of its citizens; to a person, comeliness; to a soul, wisdom; to a deed, virtue; to discourse, truth. But the opposite to these is lack of embellishment. Now a man, woman, discourse, work, city, deed, if deserving of praise must be honored with praise, but if undeserving must be censured. For it is alike aberration and stultification to censure the commendable and commend the censurable.

2. It is the duty of the same individual both to proclaim justice wholly, and to declaim against injustice holily, to confute the detractors of Helen, a woman concerning whom there has been uniform and universal praise of poets and the celebration of her name has been the commemoration of her fame. But I desire by rational calculation to free the lady's reputation, by disclosing her detractors as prevaricators, and by revealing the truth to put an end to error¹.

¹ The text of Section 2 is unsound.

¹ An abridged form of a paper read at the Sixth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Philadelphia, May 3, 1912.

3. That in nature and nurture the lady was the fairest flower of men and women is not unknown, not even to the few, for her maternity was of Leda, her paternity immortal by generation, but mortal by reputation, Tyndareus and Zeus, of whom the one was reputed in the being, the other was asserted in the affirming; the former, the greatest of humanity, the latter, the lordliest of divinity.

4. Of such origin she was endowed with godlike beauty, expressed not suppressed, which inspired in many men many mad moods of love, and she, one lovely person, assembled many personalities of proud ambition, of whom some possessed opulent riches, others the fair fame of ancient ancestry; others the vigor of native strength, others the power of acquired wisdom; and all came because of amorous contention and ambitious pretention.

5. Who he was, however, who won Helen and attained his heart's desire, and why, and how, I will not say, since to give information to the informed conduces to confirmation but conveys no delectation. Passing over in my present discourse the time now past, I will proceed to the beginning of my intended discussion and will predicate the causes by reason of which it was natural that Helen went to Troy.

6. For either by the disposition of fortune and the ratification of the gods and the determination of necessity she did what she did, or by violence confounded, or by persuasion dumbfounded or to Love surrendered. If, however, it was against her will, the culpable should not be exculpated. For it is impossible to forestall divine disposals by human proposals. It is a law of nature that the stronger is not subordinated to the weaker but the weaker is subjugated and dominated by the stronger; the stronger is the leader while the weaker is the entreater. Divinity surpasses humanity in might, in sight, and in all else. Therefore, if on fortune and the deity we must visit condemnation, the infamy of Helen should find no confirmation.

7. But if by violence she was defeated and unlawfully she was treated and to her injustice was meted, clearly her violator as a terrifier was importunate, while she, translated and violated, was unfortunate. Therefore, the barbarian who verbally, legally, actually attempted the barbarous attempt, should meet with verbal accusation, legal reprobation and actual condemnation. For Helen who was violated and from her fatherland separated and from her friends segregated should justly meet with commiseration rather than with defamation. For he was the victor and she was the victim. It is just therefore to sympathize with the latter and anathematize the former.

8. But if it was through *ἄβυσος*'s reception and the soul's deception it is not difficult to defend the situation and forefend the accusation, thus, *ἄβυσος* is a powerful potentate, who with frailest, feeblest frame works wonders. For it can put an end to fear and

make vexation vanish; it can inspire exultation and increase compassion.

9. I will show how this is so. For I must indicate this to my hearers for them to predicate. All poetry I ordain and proclaim to be composition in meter; the listeners of which are affected by passionate trepidation and compassionate perturbation and likewise tearful lamentation, since through discourse the soul suffers, as if its own, the felicity and infelicity of property and person of others.

10. Come let us turn to another consideration. Inspired incantations are provocative of charm and revocative of harm. For the power of song in association with the belief of the soul captures and enraptures and translates the soul with witchery. For there have been discovered arts twain of witchery and sorcery, which are consternation to the heart and perturbation to art.

15. Now, it has been shown that, if Helen was won over by persuasion, she is deserving of commiseration, and not condemnation. The fourth accusation I shall now proceed to answer with a fourth refutation. For if love was the doer of all these deeds, with no difficulty will she be acquitted of the crime attributed to her. The nature of that which we see is not that which we wish it to be but as it chances to be. For through the vision the soul is also in various ways smitten.

19. If, then, the eye of Helen, charmed by Alexander's beauty gave to her soul excitement and amorous incitement, what wonder? How could one who was weaker, repel and expel him who, being divine, had power divine? If it was physical diversion and psychical perversion, we should not execrate it as reprehensible but deprecate it as indefensible. For it came to whom it came by fortuitous insinuations not by judicious resolutions; by erotic compulsions, not by despotic machinations.

20. How, then, is it fair to blame Helen who, whether by love captivated, or by word persuaded, or by violence dominated, or by divine necessity subjugated, did what she did, and is completely absolved from blame?

21. By this discourse I have freed a woman from evil reputation; I have kept the promise which I made in the beginning; I have essayed to dispose of the injustice of defamation and the folly of allegation; I have prayed to compose a lucubration for Helen's adulation and my own delectation.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

LARUE VAN HOOK.

REVIEWS

Greek Literature. A Series of Lectures delivered at Columbia University. New York: The Columbia University Press (1912). Pp. 316.

The prefatory note tells us that these lectures were given at the suggestion of President Butler in the spring of 1911. It was intended that they should